UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,579	12/19/2001	Patrick R. Clark	01-331	3272

22852 7590 03/15/2006

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER	
BATES, KEVIN T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/028,579	CLARK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Bates	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 February 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on February 6, 2006.

Claims 1-52 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-15, 19-21, 23-29, 33-35, 37-43, 47-49, and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Monday (6480860).

Regarding claims 1 and 52, Monday teaches a computer based method for retrieving information for use by a requester application (Column 1, lines 49 – 51), comprising the steps of: sending, by the requestor application, an information request to a master pivot program (Column 4, lines 63 – 65), the information request including document information related to a requested information document; retrieving the document information from the information request (Column 5, lines 32 – 34); retrieving document retrieval information from a configuration database as a function of the document information (Column 7, lines 28 – 30), the document retrieval information including a destination system (Column 7, lines 28 – 30); sending the document

retrieval information and the information request to a destination pivot program coupled to the destination system; retrieving the requested information document from the destination system by the destination pivot program (Column 7, lines 53 – 57); and, sending the requested information document to the requester application (Column 7, lines 64 – 67).

Regarding claim 25, Monday teaches a computer based system for retrieving information for use by a requestor application (Column 1, lines 49 – 51), comprising: a requestor application for generating an information request (Column 4, lines 63 – 65), the information request including document information related to a requested information document (Column 5, lines 32 – 34); a configuration database containing document retrieval information (Column 7, lines 32 – 41); and, a master pivot program, coupled to the requestor application and the configuration database (Figure 2, element 125, the pivot program, 123, the requestor, and 250, the configuration database), for receiving the information request, retrieving the document information from the information request (Column 7, lines 28 – 30), and retrieving document retrieval information for the requested information document from the configuration database as a function of the document information (Column 5, lines 54 – 57) and for retrieving the requested information document from a destination system using the document retrieval information (Column 7, lines 60 – 61).

Regarding claims 2 and 29, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claim 1 and 25, respectively, wherein the information request is an extensible markup language document (Column 5, lines 3 – 5).

Regarding claim 26, Monday teaches a computer based system, as set forth in claim 25, wherein the master pivot program is adapted to deliver the requested information document to the requestor application (Column 7, lines 62 – 67).

Regarding claim 27, Monday teaches a computer based system, as set forth in claim 25, wherein the document retrieval information includes a destination and a master control interface command (Column 7, lines 47 – 50).

Regarding claim 28, Monday teaches a computer based system, as set forth in claim 27, including a master control interface adapted to execute the master control interface command (Column 7, lines 59 – 62).

Regarding claim 11, Monday teaches a computer based method for retrieving information for use by a requestor application (Column 1, lines 49 – 51), comprising the steps of: sending, by the requestor application, an information request to a master pivot program (Column 4, lines 63 – 65), the information request being an extensible markup language (XML) document (Column 5, lines 3 – 5); receiving the XML document by a master pivot program (Column 4, lines 63 – 65); retrieving, by the master pivot program, dimensions from a configuration database as a function of the XML document (Column 7, lines 50 – 58); retrieving a destination and a MCI command from the configuration database (Column 5, lines 25 – 31, where the bridge and the XML translator is the MCI); retrieving a requested information document from the destination in response to the MCI command (Column 7, lines 53 – 57); and, sending the requested information document to the requestor application (Column 7, lines 64 – 67).

Regarding claim 38, Monday teaches a computer based system for retrieving information for use by a requester application (Column 1, lines 49 – 51), comprising: a requestor application for generating an information request (Column 4, lines 63 – 65), the information request being an extensible markup language (XML) document (Column 5, lines 3 – 5); a configuration database containing document retrieval information (Column 7, lines 32 – 41); and, a master pivot program, coupled to the requestor application and the configuration database (Figure 2, element 125, the pivot program, 123, the requestor, and 250, the configuration database), for receiving the XML document (Column 4, lines 63 – 65), retrieving the document information from the information request, and retrieving dimensions (Column 7, lines 50 – 58), a destination and a MCI command from the configuration database as a function of the document information (Column 5, lines 25 – 31, where the bridge and the XML translator is the MCI), for retrieving the requested information document from a destination system in response to the MCI using the document retrieval information (Column 7, lines 53 – 57), and for sending the requested information document to the requester application (Column 7, lines 64 – 67).

Regarding claims 12 and 39, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claims 11 and 38, respectively, including the step of retrieving, by the master pivot program, a document type tag from the XML document and wherein the master pivot program retrieves the dimensions from the configuration database as a function of the document type tag (Column 7, lines 53 – 58).

Regarding claims 13 and 40, Monday teaches a method, as set forth in claims 12 and 39, respectively, including the step of retrieving dimension values from the XML document (Column 7, lines 47 – 58).

Regarding claim 14, Monday teaches a method, as set forth in claim 11, including the steps of: executing the MCI command by a master control interface (MCI) located at the destination pivot program; and, sending the XML document to the MCI, wherein the requested information document is determined by the MCI as a function of the MCI command and the XML document (Column 5, lines 25 – 34).

Regarding claim 41, Monday teaches a computer based system, as set forth in claim 38, including a master control interface (MCI) coupled to the destination pivot program, the MCI being adapted to execute the MCI command (Column 7, lines 59 – 62).

Regarding claim 42, Monday teaches a computer based system, as set forth in claim 41, wherein the MCI determines the requested information document as a function of the MCI command and the XML document (Column 5, lines 25 – 34).

Regarding claims 15 and 43, Monday teaches a method, as set forth in claims 11 and 38, respectively, wherein the step of sending the requested information document to the requestor application includes the steps of: sending the requested information document, by the destination pivot program, to the master pivot program; and, sending the requested information document, by the master pivot program, to the requester application (Column 7, lines 64 – 67).

Regarding claims 6, 19, 33, and 47, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claims 1, 11, 25, and 38, respectively, including the step receiving the document retrieval information and the information request by a master control interface (MCI) coupled to the destination pivot program (Column 5, lines 25 – 31, where the bridge and the XML translator is the MCI), the master control interface being adapted to process the information request (Column 5, lines 32 – 34).

Regarding claims 7, 20, 34, and 48, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claim 6 19, 33, and 47, respectively, wherein the MCI includes a wrapper computer program application adapted to pass the information request from the MCI to the destination system (Column 5, lines 37 – 41).

Regarding claims 8, 21, 35, and 49, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claim 1, 11, 25, and 38, respectively, wherein the configuration database is a relational database (Column 7, lines 34 – 41, where the configuration database is the association file with the DTDs).

Regarding claims 10, 23, and 37, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claim 1, 11, and 25, respectively, including the step of providing a configuration tool for maintaining the configuration database (Column 1, lines 59 – 65 where the DTDs in the association file can be dynamically configured and maintained).

Regarding claim 24, Monday teaches a computer based method for retrieving information for use by a requestor application (Column 1, lines 49 – 51), comprising the steps of: sending, by the requester application, an information request to a master pivot program (Column 4, lines 63 – 65), the information request being an extensible markup

language (XML) document (Column 5, lines 3 – 5); receiving the XML document by the master pivot program (Column 4, lines 63 – 65); retrieving, by the master pivot program, a document type tag from the XML document (Column 7, lines 53 – 58); retrieving, by the master pivot program, dimensions from a configuration database as a function of the document type tag (Column 7, lines 50 – 58); retrieving dimension values from the XML document (Column 7, lines 47 – 58); retrieving a destination (Column 7, lines 28 – 30) and a MCI command from the configuration database (Column 5, lines 25 – 31, where the bridge and the XML translator is the MCI); sending the MCI command to a destination pivot program located at the destination (Column 7, lines 53 – 57); executing the MCI command by a master control interface (MCI) located at the destination pivot program; sending the XML document to the MCI; sending a requested information document, by the MCI, to the destination pivot program as a function of the MCI command and the XML document (Column 7, lines 47 – 50); sending the requested information document, by the destination pivot program, to the master pivot program; and, sending the requested information document, by the master pivot program to the requestor application (Column 7, lines 62 – 67).

Regarding claim 51, Monday teaches a computer based system for retrieving information for use by a requester application (Column 1, lines 49 – 51), comprising: a requestor application for generating an information request (Column 4, lines 63 – 65), the information request, the information request being an extensible markup language (XML) document (Column 5, lines 3 – 5); a configuration database containing document retrieval information (Column 7, lines 32 – 41); and, a master pivot program, coupled to

the requestor application and the configuration database (Figure 2, element 125, the pivot program, 123, the requestor, and 250, the configuration database), for receiving the XML document (Column 4, lines 63 – 65) and retrieving a document type tag from the XML document, for retrieving dimensions (Column 7, lines 50 – 58), a destination, and a MCI command from the configuration database as a function of the XML document (Column 5, lines 25 – 31, where the bridge and the XML translator is the MCI), and for sending the MCI command to a destination pivot program located at the destination (Column 7, lines 53 – 57); and a master control interface (MCI) located at the destination pivot program, the MCI being adapted to execute the MCI command, retrieve a requested information document as a function of the MCI command, and responsively send a requested information document to the destination pivot program (Column 7, lines 47 – 50), wherein the destination pivot program is adapted to send the requested information document to the master pivot program and the master pivot program is adapted to send the requested information document to the requester application (Column 7, lines 62 – 67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5, 17-18, 30-32, and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monday in view of Seo (6732360).

Regarding claims 3, 16, 30, and 44, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claims 1 11, 25, and 38, respectively.

Monday does not explicitly indicate the step of sending the information request to the master pivot program includes the step of calling an application program interface (API).

Seo teaches a system with a client, a pivot program, and a destination pivot that includes an API interface for communication between the client and the master pivot program (Column 3, lines 21 – 26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the rejection was made to use Seo's teaching of using an API to communicate between the master pivot and client in Monday's system in order to allow the client to interface with many databases and a JDBC broker as the master pivot (Column 1, lines 18 – 24; lines 59 – 64).

Regarding claims 4, 17, 31, and 45, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claims 3, 16, 30, and 44.

Monday does not explicitly indicate the step of creating, by the API, a structure of routing information.

Seo teaches a system with an API between a client and a master broker that includes creating a structure of routing information (Column 3, lines 60 – 62; Column 4, lines 8 –10; lines 16 – 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the rejection was made to use Seo's teaching of using an API to communicate between the

master pivot and client in Monday's system in order to allow the client to interface with many databases and a JDBC broker as the master pivot (Column 1, lines 18 – 24; lines 59 – 64).

Regarding claims 5, 18, 32, and 46, Monday teaches a computer based method, as set forth in claims 4, 17, 31, and 45.

Monday does not explicitly indicate the step of sending the information request to the master pivot program includes the step of sending the information request to the master pivot program through a socket.

Seo teaches the step of sending the information request to the master pivot program through a socket (Column 3, lines 54 – 59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the rejection was made to use Seo's teaching of using an API to communicate between the master pivot and client in Monday's system in order to allow the client to interface with many databases and a JDBC broker as the master pivot (Column 1, lines 18 – 24; lines 59 – 64).

Claim 9, 22, 36, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monday in view of Rutkowski (5826270).

Regarding claims 9, 22, 36, and 50, Monday teaches computer based method, as set forth in claims 1, 11, 25, and 38.

Monday does not explicitly indicate that the configuration database includes routing rules for a plurality of requestor applications and destination applications.

Rutkowski teaches a database system with requestors, a pivot, and databases (Column 4, lines 14 – 21) that includes routing rules for a plurality of requestor applications and destination applications (Column 5, lines 11 – 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Rutkowski's teaching in Monday's system in order to allow multiple requestors issued requests at the same time (Column 2, lines 19 – 24).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the reference, Monday, does not teach "an information request including document information related to a requested information document" and does not teach a configuration database.

The examiner disagrees, regarding the idea that the reference does not teach document information being contained in an information request, in Column 7, lines 21 – 34, the reference discloses that in a request in XML that gets parsed out for information about the request which includes as described in the section, information identify data sources which contain the data requested, and also the data type, which are both able to be considered document information.

Regarding the idea that the reference does not teach a configuration database, in Column 7, lines 32 – 41, the reference discloses an "associate file" containing "DTD" that is queried to identify any type of DTDs relating to the data type requested and the database and uses that information pulled from the associate file, which can be

considered a database of DTD information, to configure the request to the identified database, as seen in Column 7, lines 48 – 52, so the associate file is operating at a database containing configuration information, so it meets the claimed limitation of a configuration database.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB
March 9, 2006

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER